

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/809,405	•	03/15/2001	Frank Rademacher	964-010251 3576		
28289	7590	03/21/2006		EXAMINER		
THE WEBI		,		SENFI, BEI	HROOZ M	
436 SEVEN				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PITTSBURG	GH, PA	15219		2621		
				DATE MAIL ED: 03/21/2004	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/809,405	RADEMACHER ET AL	RADEMACHER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Behrooz Senfi	2613		
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addres	SS	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may be a searned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a root will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this commu		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30	December 2005.			
, ,	nis action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	vance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the me	erits is	
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8 and 10-15</u> is/are pending in the	application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8 and 10-15</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	I/or election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	ccepted or b) objected to I	by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ection is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	.121(d).	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-1	52.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:				
1. Certified copies of the priority docume		nnligation No		
2. Certified copies of the priority docume3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority			70	
application from the International Bure		received in this Mational Stat	ge.	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	received.		
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)		
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0)/Mail Date Iformal Patent Application (PTO-152		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		,	

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/30/2005 has been entered.

Claim 9 has been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-8, 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lanza et al (US 5,938,710) in view of Rosinski et al (US 5,793,308).

Regarding claim 1, Lanza '710 teaches, an industrial truck (i.e. fig. 1, 100), comprising: a driver's seat located in a driver's cab, the driver's seat oriented in the forward direction (i.e. fig. 1, shows the seat, which is in forward direction), and a first camera pointing toward the rear (i.e. fig. 1, camera 3), the first camera mounted on the rear of the vehicle to the rear of the driver's seat (fig. 1, camera 3). Furthermore, Lanza

'710 teaches (i.e. fig. 3, cameras 1 and 3, abstract, col. 5, lines 46 – 54) a navigation system including navigation camera for monitoring the surrounding area and are used with aid of an image processing system to be operated manually and/or automatically.

Lanza '710 is silent in regards to, at least one additional camera is mounted on the rear of the vehicle to the rear of the driver's seat and on an upper segment, at a height greater than the first height, wherein the first camera provides a view of a distant area and the at least one additional camera provides a view of a near area behind the industrial truck, and wherein the image taken with the first camera and/or the image taken with the at least one additional camera can be displayed on the screen located in the vicinity of the drivers seat.

However such features are well known and used as evidenced by Rosinski '308 (i.e. figs. 5B, 7A, 8B and 11B), which teaches camera arrangements in different type of vehicle for viewing and monitoring at different angles, and also teaches that the images captured by the cameras can be selectively displayed to the operator (i.e. fig. 1, display 3, col. 3, lines 33 - 41).

Taking the combined teaching of Lanza and Rosinski as a whole, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the navigation system of Lanza '710, by incorporating multiple cameras for monitoring the surrounding vehicle from different angle and display the images to the vehicle operator, as suggested by Rosinski, to allow a vehicle operator to view blind spots at the rear end sides of the vehicle (col. 2, lines 59 – 62).

It is noted that, Lanza is silent in regards to counterweight located on a rear of the truck. However, Official Notice is taken to note that this type of vehicle must necessarily have a counterweight (which can be a part of the frame) in order to keep the vehicle balanced.

Regarding claim 2, combination of Lanza and Rosinski teaches, wherein there are two additional cameras to view the near area (i.e. col. 4, lines 14 – 15 of Rosinski).

Regarding claim 3, it is noted that combination of Lanza and Rosinski is silent in regards to, camera equipped with a wide-angle lens, as claimed. Examiner takes

Official Notice to note that, the use of wide-angle lens in the camera is notoriously well known and conventional for the benefit of covering larger area in video navigation and/or monitoring. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement such teaching as they are notoriously well known, to view or cover larger area under camera monitoring.

Regarding claim 4, combination of Lanza and Rosinski teaches, wherein the screen is effectively connected with a switching device by which the far area viewed by the first camera or the near area viewed by the at least one additional camera can be selectively displayed on the screen as desired (i.e. col. 7, lines 8 – 15 of Rosinski).

Regarding claims 5-6, the limitations claimed have been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 4 above.

Regarding claims 7 – 8, wherein the screen is effectively connected with an

Art Unit: 2613

image mixer by which the images taken by the two additional cameras are superimposed on each other on the screen (i.e.figs. 2-3, CPU 21 and MCU 211, col. 3, lines 30-32, col. 6, lines 4-6 of Rosinski).

Regarding claim 10, the limitations claimed have been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 11, the limitation "screen is located inside a driver cab" is similar and has the same functionality as to the screen as taught by Rosinski, and discussed earlier with respect to claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 12 - 13, combination of Lanza and Rosinski teaches, wherein the industrial truck has a steering device with an electrical steering sensor (i.e. fig. 1, device 4, col. 1, lines 55 – 60, col. 2, lines 23 – 26 and col. 5, lines 57 – 67 of Rosinski).

Regarding claim 14, combination of Lanza and Rosinski teaches, screen display, for displaying images captured by the camera to the vehicle operator, as discussed with respect to claim 1 above. However, it is noted that combination of Lanza and Rosinski is silent in regards to screen is the form of a "flat screen". Examiner takes Official Notice to note that, the use of a flat screen is well known and conventional in the prior art of the record. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to use a flat screen as an alternative screen, for providing images captured by the camera to the vehicle operator.

Regarding claim 15, combination of Lanza and Rosinski teaches, fork lift truck (i.e. fig. 1, truck 100 of Lanza).

Contact

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Behrooz Senfi** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7339.**

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Mehrdad Dastouri** can be reached on **(571) 272-7418**.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Va. 22314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relative to the status of the application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (571) 272-6000,

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

B.M.S.

3/19/2006